



Patent  
Attorney's Docket No. 040070-549

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of )  
Jacobus C. HAARTSEN ) Group Art Unit: 2634  
Application No.: 09/418,562 ) Examiner: C. Odom  
Filed: October 15, 1999 ) Confirmation No.: 9055  
For: HOP SEQUENCE ADAPTATION IN A )  
FREQUENCY-HOPPING )  
COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM )

AMENDMENT/REPLY TRANSMITTAL LETTER

RECEIVED

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

MAR 05 2003

Sir:

Technology Center 2600

Enclosed is a reply for the above-identified patent application.

- A Petition for Extension of Time is also enclosed.
- A Terminal Disclaimer and the [ ] \$55.00 (2814) [ ] \$110.00 (1814) fee due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d) are also enclosed.
- Also enclosed is/are \_\_\_\_\_.
- Small entity status is hereby claimed.
- Applicant(s) request continued examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 and enclose the [ ] \$375.00 (2801) [ ] \$750.00 (1801) fee due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(e).
- Applicant(s) previously submitted \_\_\_, on \_\_\_, for which continued examination is requested.
- Applicant(s) request suspension of action by the Office until at least \_\_\_, which does not exceed three months from the filing of this RCE, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.103(c). The required fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(i) is enclosed.
- A Request for Entry and Consideration of Submission under 37 C.F.R. § 1.129(a) (1809/2809) is also enclosed.
- No additional claim fee is required.

[ ] An additional claim fee is required, and is calculated as shown below:

A M E N D E D C L A I M S					
	NO. OF CLAIMS	HIGHEST NO. OF CLAIMS PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	EXTRA CLAIMS	RATE	ADDT'L FEE
Total Claims		MINUS =		× \$18.00 (1202) =	
Independent Claims		MINUS =		× \$84.00 (1201) =	
If Amendment adds multiple dependent claims, add \$280.00 (1203)					
Total Amendment Fee					
If small entity status is claimed, subtract 50% of Total Amendment Fee					
<b>TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE DUE FOR THIS AMENDMENT</b>					

[ ] A claim fee in the amount of \$\_\_\_\_\_ is enclosed.

[ ] Charge \$\_\_\_\_\_ to Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.20(d) and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800. This paper is submitted in duplicate.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: Penny L. Caudle  
Penny L. Caudle  
Registration No. 46,607

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620

Date: March 4, 2003



#691  
Req For Recons  
3-7-03

Patent  
Attorney's Docket No. 040070-549

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of )  
Jacobus C. HAARTSEN ) Group Art Unit: 2634  
Application No.: 09/418,562 ) Examiner: C. Odom  
Filed: October 15, 1999 ) Confirmation No. 9055  
For: HOP SEQUENCE ADAPTATION IN )  
A FREQUENCY-HOPPING )  
COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM )

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**RECEIVED**

MAR 05 2003

Technology Center 2600

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed on December 30, 2003, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and/or objections to claims 1-30 in view of the remarks presented below.

At the outset, Applicant notes with appreciation the indication that claims 8-15 and 23-30 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowed if rewritten independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In paragraph 2, the Office Action objects to the specification. More specifically, the Action objects to the spelling of the term "unlicenced" used in the specification. In response, Applicant respectfully notes that both "licence" and "license" are accepted spellings. Therefore, Applicant prefers not to amend the specification. Reconsideration of the of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 3, the Office Action objects to claim 1. More specifically, the Action requests that the colon in line 8 be removed. Applicant respectfully notes that the colon in line 8 of claim 1 clearly denotes that if the selected hop channel is a forbidden hop channel then both the following steps are employed. However, removal of the colon may lead to